

file

SELECTION SUMMARY

Both Raytheon and CSC had excellent Technical and Past Performance proposals and essentially equal probable cost.

No discriminators were found in Factor 2, Past Performance, or in Factor 3, Cost. The evaluated cost was essentially equal for both offerors and both teams were found to have extensive applicable experience and very good past performance records. While both proposals were excellent, it was clear that there were discriminators in Factor 1, Technical Proposal. Raytheon received 41 strengths, 16 of which were significant. CSC received 31 strengths, 11 of which were significant. The additional strengths offered by Raytheon are felt to be of substantial value to the Government. Neither offeror received any significant weaknesses. CSC was assigned 3 regular weaknesses, while Raytheon received one.

Raytheon was determined to have a superior proposal in the "Management Approach" and "ISO Compliance" Subfactors of Factor 1, while CSC had a superior proposal in the "Small Business Participation" Subfactor of Factor 1. Note that the subfactors were in descending order of importance, as follows:

- a. Staffing
- b. Management Approach
- c. Small Business Participation
- d. ISO Compliance

A summary of the significant strengths identified for each offeror in the Competitive Range follows.

CSC

For Subfactor a, Staffing, CSC received a significant strength for a low-risk initial staffing plan, with a large percentage of incumbents in place, plus an aggressive plan to recruit and hire other incumbents. Other significant strengths were identified for their plan to obtain vendor certifications and the comprehensive plans to maintain critical skills. The proposed Program Manager has extensive and successful experience directly related to CONITS.

As regards Subfactor b, Management Approach, CSC received significant strengths for the low risk phase-in plan as well as their approach for technology improvements. CSC also offered a detailed plan for ODIN interface, supported by experience. The proposal included a thorough discussion of the process for developing metrics, including identification of a number of CONITS-related metrics. As regards IT security, CSC presented viable options which demonstrated knowledge in this area. For Subfactor c, Small Business Participation, CSC proposed to exceed 3 of the TOR-specified goals. For Subfactor d, ISO Compliance, CSC's recent receipt of third-party ISO registration was cited as a significant strength.

Raytheon

For Subfactor a, Staffing, Raytheon received a significant strength for a low-risk initial staffing plan, with a fair percentage of incumbents in place, plus an aggressive plan to recruit and hire other incumbents. Raytheon offered some very innovative approaches to staffing. Other significant strengths were identified for the comprehensive and well-supported plan for responding to workload surges, and the wide range of relevant and substantiated corporate resources. The proposed Program Manager has extensive experience directly related to CONITS.

As regards Subfactor b, Management Approach, Raytheon proposed a thorough phase-in plan as well as an excellent risk mitigation analysis and solutions to support the phase-in plan. They offered a comprehensive discussion of strategies for improvements in CONITS. Raytheon proposed an excellent approach for managing multiple objectives as well as a well-defined and logical Task Order organization approach. Their plan to interface with ODIN is thorough. Raytheon also proposed a thorough approach for developing metrics with a suite of sample metrics. As regards IT security, Raytheon presented viable options that demonstrated knowledge in this area. For Subfactor d, ISO Compliance, Raytheon was found to have a mature third-party registered, corporate-wide ISO quality management system and a comprehensive Six Sigma program. In addition, Raytheon offered excellent quality planning procedures.

In summary, the choice between Raytheon and CSC was clearly a choice between two excellent proposals. However, Raytheon's proposal was stronger from the standpoints of significant strengths, regular strengths, and the value of those strengths. Raytheon therefore represents the Best Value to the Government, considering all 3 Factors, Technical, Past Performance, and Cost.